Case 3:15-cr-00444-CRB Document 15 Filed 09/17/15 Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	15	444	CRO		
Plaintiff, v. Hanai lbrahim)))	STIPULATED OUNDER THE S				3	
Defendant.)						
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record Speedy Trial Act from, 2015 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of \$161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and	the public	and the defendan	t in a s	peedy trial.	See 18 U.S	er the se served S.C. §	
Failure to grant a continuance wo See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).		ely to result in a m	niscarri	age of just	ice.		
The case is so unusual or so comp defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to e itself within the time limits estable	ne prosecu expect ade	ition, or the quate preparation	e existe for pre	ence of novertrial proced	el questions edings or th	s of fact e trial	
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).						
Failure to grant a continuance wo counsel's other scheduled case co See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv)	mmitmen	• •			•	. •	
Failure to grant a continuance wo necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv)	n, taking i	• •					
IT IS SO ORDERED.	. :	•			T 1 -	7 2015	
DATED: 9//7/15 STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	ı	SALLIE KIM United States M Assistant United		7 	SEP I SUSAN CLERK, U.S. NORTHERN DIST	Y. SOONG DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
		Scott D.	7	oiner			

Case 3:15-cr-00444-CRB Document 15 Filed 09/17/15 Page 2 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 15 444 (RG)
Plaintiff, v. Hanai (brahim)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Defendant.)	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on Speedy Trial Act from Speedy Tria	c and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be lill See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	kely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosect or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ad	to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due dil	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, igence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	asonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would unrean necessary for effective preparation, taking See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	G
IT IS SO ORDERED.	FILED
DATED: 9//7/15	salle. SEP 172015
STIPULATED:	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge SEP SUSAN Y. SOONG SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney
	▼ '